



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/428,813	10/28/1999	SAMI INKINEN	297-008970-U	5161

7590 10/18/2005

CLARENCE A GREEN CLARENCE A GREEN
PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CO 06430

EXAMINER

KUMAR, PANKAJ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2631

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/428,813

Applicant(s)

INKINEN ET AL.

Examiner

Pankaj Kumar

Art Unit

2631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/27/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues (on page 11) that the references do not teach that an electronic device thinks it is sending data to memory when in fact it is sending data to a wireless device. This is not persuasive since applicant has not claimed this.
3. Applicant argues that the references do not teach ordinary expansion memory from the viewpoint of the electronic device since the references teach a PCMCIA slot which is not a memory. This is not persuasive since PCMCIA slot can accommodate various devices such as a camera which would have a memory buffer.
4. Applicant argues that the references do not teach ordinary expansion memory from the viewpoint of the electronic device since the references require auxiliary devices with communications capabilities to act as I/O devices. This is not persuasive since the auxiliary devices are the devices which have the additional memory and hence expansion memory. The ability for the auxiliary devices to act as I/O devices does not take away from the fact that these auxiliary devices have additional memory and hence expansion memory. Also, the ability for the auxiliary devices to act as I/O devices does not take away from the fact that the auxiliary devices have additional ordinary memory and also that different types of auxiliary devices can be used and hence different types of ordinary devices which meet PCMCIA criteria.
5. Applicant argues that the PCMCIA standard is a very broad standard that is applicable to many things including wireless transceivers and hence PCMCIA is not ordinary expansion memory. This is not persuasive since the PCMCIA standard is a very broad standard which is

Art Unit: 2631

applicable to many things such as an ordinary expansion memory. For example, the following site teaches PCMCIA for memory:

<http://www.edgetechcorp.com/store/Products/Apple/PowerBook/500-Series-w%5Eslsh-PCMCIA-Expansion-Module/>

6. Applicant argues that the references are using the PCMCIA slots for I/O communications and thus the PCMCIA slots are not expansion memory slots. This is not persuasive. Bass teaches in the background of the invention paragraph 1: “wireless modem that is implemented utilizing Personal Computer Memory Card International Association (PCMCIA) cards”. Thus, even though the reference is using the slot for a wireless modem, the slot in itself is a memory card slot. This memory slot is in a computer which has its own memory and hence this memory slot is an expansion of the computer’s memory.

7. Applicant argues that even though Okaue teaches general purpose expansion memory location and general purpose expansion memory, it is not possible to combine Okaue with the other references since the other references teach I/O device at the PCMCIA slot. This is not persuasive since the device attached to the PCMCIA slot is easily replaceable. Also, Bass teaches in the background of the invention paragraph 1: “wireless modem that is implemented utilizing Personal Computer Memory Card International Association (PCMCIA) cards”. Thus, even though the reference is using the slot for a wireless modem, the slot in itself is a memory card slot. This memory slot is in a computer which has its own memory and hence this memory slot is an expansion of the computer’s memory. Thus it is possible to combine Okaue with the other references.

Art Unit: 2631

8. Applicant argues that the combination of Okaue with the other references does not teach a data communications device that has the dual functionality of setting up and maintaining a short range wireless RF connection with an external wireless device while simultaneously appearing as an ordinary expansion memory from the viewpoint of the host device it is attached to. This is not persuasive since applicant has not claimed this.

9. Applicant argues that the erase prevention switch in the reference is not equivalent to preventing change of the first and second memories since the erase prevention switch merely prevents overwriting the memory. This is not persuasive since the first memory is the data in the memory and the second memory is the data that is prevented from being written to a memory by the erase prevention switch.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bass USPN 5,896,574 in view of Knighton USPN 6,032,866. See prior action for details.

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bass USPN 5,896,574 in view of Nakajima USPN 6,085,225 and Knighton USPN 6,032,866. See prior action for details.

Art Unit: 2631

13. Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bass USPN 5,896,574 in view of Knighton USPN 6,032,866 and Okaue USPN 6,170,743. See prior action for details.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claim 9 is allowed. See a prior action for details.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2631


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pankaj Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3011. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs and Fri after 8AM to after 6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad H. Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pankaj Kumar
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2631

PK


MOHAMMED GHAYOUR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER